

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/830,144	04/21/2004	Johnson Jennifer	3064-02	7839
25534 7590 04/17/2007 CAHN & SAMUELS LLP 2000 P STREET NW			EXAMINER	
			NGUYE	NGUYEN, VI X
SUITE 200 WASHINGTO	N. DC 20036		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,		3734	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		04/17/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

,	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/830,144	JENNIFER ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Victor X. Nguyen	3734			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	ne correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE = Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply to vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS, cause the application to become ABAND	FION. be timely filed from the mailing date of this communication. ONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>12 M</u>	arch 2007.				
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☒ This	action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-4 and 18-20 is/are 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 5-17 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	withdrawn from consideration				
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) □ accepted or b) □ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/13/05;8/25/06.		ail Date nal Patent Application			

Application/Control Number: 10/830,144 Page 2

Art Unit: 3734

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. This application contains claims 1-4 and 18-20 drawn to non-elected inventions. In March 12, 2007, applicant elected to prosecute Group II that associated with claims 5-17. Furthermore, applicant has stated that there is no reason for insisting on restriction. The search and examination of the entire application can be made without serious burden. This is found not persuasive because the examiner has found in this case (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because the combination does not require a ring attached to the base. The subcombination has separate utility as a belt which provides to support a body portion. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper. The requirement is deemed proper and is therefore made Final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 5-8,14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by McMillan et al (6,899,720). McMillan et al disclose in figure 1, a medical tourniquet having the limitations as recited in the above listed claims, including: a handle 20 has an aperture 21 disposed therein, a strap 12 engages with a base 42 at a first point upstream (the first point upstream can begin from the left side of element 12, where the strap passes through the aperture and the strap being engaged with the base at a second point downstream (the downstream occurs to the right side of element 12) from the handle, where the strap can be manufactured to any suitable length or width (see col. 1, lines 50-52, col.. 3, lines 26-36), where the strap can pass through the aperture which having a loop at 24, and where the tourniquet further has a buckle attached to the strap where the device further has a handle lock which includes a ring either at 24 or 28, where the ring is movably attached to the base (see col. 5, lines 14-35).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McMillan (6,899,720).

Regarding claims 9-13, McMillan discloses the invention substantially as claimed (see col. 4, lines 51-67 and col. 5, lines 1-15). However, McMillan is silent regarding the base

Application/Control Number: 10/830,144 Page 4

Art Unit: 3734

is substantially rigid. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to construct base is substantially rigid, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basic of its suitability for the intended use or as a matter of obvious design choice. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416. Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to manufacture the base is rigid, so that it helps to prevent any crushing of the base when the handle is twisted.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,602,214 to Heinzeth U.S. Pat. No. 6,540,707 to Stark

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Victor X. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4699. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8-4.30 P.M).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Hayes can be reached on (571) 272-4697. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/830,144

Art Unit: 3734

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Victor X Nguyen Examiner

Art Unit 3734

VN - 4/12/2007

MICHAEL J. HAYES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

My Hayes

Page 5

Upon Virior